

CARRINGTON MORTGAGE SERVICES, LLC,
Plaintiff(s),
vs.
SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC,
Defendant(s).

ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY PLAN

Pending before the Court is a proposed discovery plan seeking approximately 300 days to conduct discovery. Docket No. 22. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days. *See, e.g.,* Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The pending discovery plan appears to be on a form that counsel in this case and other counsel in similar cases have been submitting repeatedly in an attempt to obtain an extended discovery period. That form provides two basic reasons for a longer discovery period: (1) the parties have filed many similar lawsuits in a short timeframe and (2) the parties need “[a]dditional time” to conduct discovery. The undersigned has now explained to Defendant’s counsel at least five different times that these reasons are plainly insufficient to establish good cause for an extended discovery period. *First Horizon Home Loans v. Day Dawn Crossing Homeowners Ass’n*, Case No. 2:15-cv-1262-JAD-NJK (Docket No. 19); *Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Flamingo Trails No. 7 Landscape Maintenance Ass’n, Inc.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-1268-RFB-NJK (Docket No. 14); *Deutsche Bank Nat’l Trust Co. v. Southern Highlands Community Ass’n*, 2:15-cv-1276-RFB-NJK (Docket No. 27); *Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Aurora Canyon Homeowners Ass’n*, Case No. 2:15-cv-1308-MMD-NJK (Docket No. 26);

1 *Deutsche Bank Nat'l Trust v. Seven Hills Master Community Ass'n*, Case No. 2:15-cv-1373-APG-NJK
2 (Docket No. 28).¹ The Court once again reiterates that these reasons do not provide sufficiently good
3 cause to allow a discovery period beyond the presumptively reasonable 180-day period outlined in the
4 local rules.

5 The only other reason provided is that "guidance" may be provided from the Nevada Supreme
6 Court on lien issues relevant to this case. See Docket No. 22 at 2 (citing *GMAC Mortgage, LLC v.*
7 *Nevada Assoc. Servs., Inc.*, Case No. 65260 (Nev.)). This undeveloped assertion also does not establish
8 good cause for an extended discovery period.

9 For the reasons discussed above, the Court hereby **DENIES** the pending discovery plan. No later
10 than October 12, 2015, the parties shall submit a new discovery plan that comports with the local rules.
11 The Court further **ADMONISHES** Defendant's counsel for repeatedly submitting discovery plans that
12 the undersigned has already found are improper. Defendant's counsel is expected to ensure that the
13 arguments presented have a reasonable basis in law and fact, and should expect that continued disregard
14 for the undersigned's rulings may result in the imposition of sanctions. Cf. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: October 7, 2015

17 
18 _____
19 NANCY J. KOPPE
20 United States Magistrate Judge
21
22
23
24
25

26 _____
27 ¹ Defendant's counsel has also been informed of the deficiency of such a discovery plan by other
28 judges in the District. See, e.g., *Wells Fargo Financial Nev. 2, Inc. v. SFR Investments Pool I, LLC*, Case
No. 2:15-cv-576-RFB-CWH (Docket No. 27) (rejecting similar discovery plan); *Nationstar Mortgage, LLC*
v. SFR Investments Pool I, LLC, 2:15-cv-133-APG-PAL (Docket No 11) (same).